

Remark

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 1, 8, 15-17 and 22 have been amended. No claims have been cancelled. Therefore, claims 1-25 are present for examination.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejection*Hild*

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 6-13, 17 and 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. §102 (e) as being anticipated by Hild, U.S. Patent No. 6,088,706 ("Hild"). Hild shows a system in which multiple copies of a shared file are maintained in different mobile devices, but in Hild, the copies are only updated through "the network." When a computer does not have access to the network, it works autonomously. In the operational modes of Figure 3, there is only one mode 310 which has any connection to another system and this connection is only with the "stationary host" 7:47. At Col. 7, line 67 this is referred to as the "state of connectivity with the rest of the network." Connection with "the network" is stressed throughout Col. 8 (see e.g. lines 39, 47, 59, 63). In other words, users operate locally with local copies of the shared file (Col. 7, lines 11-12) and then when possible connect to "the network" to synchronize.

Claim 1, for example, does not require a connection to a network. Instead a direct connection is established between first and second mobile computer devices. This allows data to be synchronized even when a network connection is not available. In addition, Claim 1 specifically recites determining if the second device belongs to the workgroup of the first device. While Hild states that a workgroup can be set up (Col. 7, lines 56-57), there is no description of determining if another device belongs to that workgroup.

Attorney Docket No. 42P10456
Application No. 09/752,536

For at least the reasons recited above, Claim 1, is believed to be allowable over the references. Claims 17 and 22 are believed to be allowable on the same grounds. The remaining claims depend from one of the above claims and are believed to be allowable therefore as well as for the specific limitations set forth in each claim respectively.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection

Hild in view of Moura

The Examiner has rejected claims 2-5, 14-16, 18-19 and 22-25 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Hild in view of Moura, U.S. Patent No. 5,818,845 ("Moura"). Moura was cited as showing polling. It does not overcome the limitations of Hild described above. Accordingly, this rejection is also believed to be traversed.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections have been overcome by the amendment and remark, and that the claims as amended are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejections be withdrawn and the claims as amended be allowed.

Invitation for a Telephone Interview

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Request for an Extension of Time

Applicants respectfully petition for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) for such an extension. Charge our Deposit Account.

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 12/20/04



Gordon R. Lindeen III
Reg. No. 33,192

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(303) 740-1980

Attorney Docket No. 42P10456
Application No. 09/752,536